

Serial No. 10/056,258
July 29, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated April 29, 2003
Page 7 of 10

REMARKS

Claims 2-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend the Title of the Invention, the Drawings and claims 2 and 3 and cancel claims 1 and 13-17.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 3-7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features and method steps of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 13-17 have been canceled since these claims are directed to an invention which was non-elected without traverse.

The drawings were objected to because Figs. 12 and 13A-13C were not designated as --PRIOR ART--. Applicants have amended Figs. 12 and 13A-13C to be properly designated as --PRIOR ART--. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

The specification was objected to because the Title of the Invention was allegedly not descriptive. Applicants have amended the Title of the Invention as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 2-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 2 to correct the informality noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 9, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Illyefalvi-Titez et al., entitled "Application of Laser Engraving for the Fabrication of Fine Resolution Printed Wiring Laminates for MCM-Ls". In addition, Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Forterre et al. (U.S. 5,495,210). Claims 1, 8, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsujimoto et al. (U.S. 6,449,123). And finally, Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Illyefalvi-Titez. Applicants

Serial No. 10/056,258
July 29, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated April 29, 2003
Page 8 of 10

respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 2 has been amended to recite:

"A method of manufacturing a nonreciprocal circuit device comprising a metal case including central conductors, a ferrite core arranged near the central conductors, and a permanent magnet for applying a static magnetic field to the ferrite core, the method comprising the steps of:

marking information onto the metal case by irradiating the metal case with a laser beam; and
heating the nonreciprocal circuit device after the information has been marked onto the metal case." (emphasis added)

The Examiner alleged that Forterre et al. teaches a method of manufacturing a nonreciprocal circuit device including the steps of "marking information of holes 24 onto a metal case (dielectric layer 6) by irradiating with a laser beam (see col. 4, lines 10-13)." In addition, the Examiner alleged that Forterre et al. "further teaches heating the circuit after laser marking by firing the device to laminate it (see col. 6, lines 60-63)." Applicants respectfully disagree.

In contrast to the present claimed invention and the Examiner's allegations, element 24 of Forterre et al. is specifically disclosed as being a metallized ground hole which is formed an internal element of the electronic device of Forterre et al. More specifically, as is clearly seen in Figs. 1 and 2 of Forterre et al., the ground hole 24 is formed in the metallic layer 4 which is clearly disposed inside of the metal case 8 and is clearly covered by the magnet 7. There is absolutely no disclosure or suggestion whatsoever in Forterre et al. of any marking of any type being done on the metal case 8. In fact, Forterre et al. does not disclose any marking of any information at all, and instead merely teaches using a laser to form a metallized ground hole in an internal component of an electronic device, which certainly cannot be fairly construed as "information" marked on a metal case as recited in the present claimed invention and disclosed in the specification, as originally filed.

In addition, the Examiner alleged that the dielectric layer 6 of Forterre et al.

Serial No. 10/056,258

July 29, 2003

Reply to the Office Action dated April 29, 2003

Page 9 of 10

(X) corresponds to a metal case as recited in the claimed invention. This is clearly incorrect. In contrast, the dielectric layer 6 of Forterre et al. is specifically disclosed as being made of a paste including "silica grains" (see col. 3, line 51 through col. 4, line 2) which is clearly not metallic. Furthermore, as clearly seen in Fig. 1 of Forterre et al., the dielectric layer 6 is disposed between two ferrites 1, 2 which are disposed within a metallic case 8. Thus, even if the dielectric layer 6 of Forterre et al. could be fairly construed as being made of metal, since the dielectric layer 6 is clearly disposed inside of a metallic case 8, the dielectric layer 6 of Forterre et al. certainly cannot be fairly construed as a metal case, as recited in the present claimed invention.

Furthermore, since the holes 24 of Forterre et al. are disposed within the metallic case 8, and are completely covered and concealed on one side by the magnet 7 and on the other side by the metallic layer 3, the holes 24 of Forterre et al. clearly do NOT provide any "information," since the holes cannot even be seen from outside of the metal case 8 of Forterre et al. ~~~~~

Thus, Forterre et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the step of "marking information onto the metal case by irradiating the metal case with a laser beam" as recited in the present claimed invention.

Neither Illyefalvi-Titez et al. nor Tsujimoto et al. teach or suggest the steps of "marking information onto the metal case by irradiating the metal case with a laser beam" and "heating the nonreciprocal circuit device after the information has been marked onto the metal case" as recited in the present claimed invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Illyefalvi-Titez et al. and Tsujimoto et al. fail to cure the deficiencies of Forterre et al. described above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Forterre et al., Illyefalvi-Titez et al. and Tsujimoto et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of method steps and features recited in claim 2 of the present application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit

Serial No. 10/056,258
July 29, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated April 29, 2003
Page 10 of 10

that Claim 2 is allowable. Claims 3-12 depend upon claim 2, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 2 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 29, 2003



Christopher A. Bennett
Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080